

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed February 10, 2006 (the "Office Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1, 9, 19-20, 22, 26-28, 30-31, 39, 49-50, 52, 56-58, 60-61, 69, 79, 80, 82, and 103-110 were pending in the Application. The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 9, 19-20, 22, 26-28, 30-31, 39, 49, 50, 52, 56-58, 60-61, 69, 79, 80, 82, and 103-110. Applicants amend Claims 1, 31, 61, and 103 and cancel Claims 27-28 and 57-58. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**Examiner Interview**

Attorney for Applicants (Chad C. Walters, Reg. No. 48,022) conducted a telephone conference with Examiner Lisa Hashem on June 7, 2006. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's time in conducting the telephone conference. Claims 103 and 110 were discussed in the telephone conference with respect to the cited references used in the claim rejections. No agreement was reached.

**Section 102 Rejections**

Claims 1, 9, 19-20, 22, 26-28, 30-31, 39, 49-50, 52, 56-58, 60-61, 69, 79-80, 82, 103-105 and 110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,571,221 by Stewart et al. ("*Stewart*"). Claims 106-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stewart* as applied to Claim 103 and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0029189 by Titus et al. ("*Titus*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 110 recites detecting in content of a wireless data call a predefined event and initiating a service in response to detecting the predefined event, wherein the predefined event comprises a quality of service (QoS) event and wherein the wireless data call service comprises altering billing for the data call. The Office Action suggests that *Stewart* discloses these elements at col. 10, lines 41-55; col. 11, lines 49-63; col. 12, lines 33-42; col. 13, lines 45-63; col. 14, lines 17-43; col. 14, line 44 – col. 15, line 44 and col. 16, lines 16-26. Office Action, page 6. However, none of these cited portion, nor any other portion of *Stewart*, discloses altering

billing for a wireless data call in response to detecting a quality of service event in content of the data call. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 110 is patentable over the cited art used in the rejection and request that the rejection of Claim 110 be withdrawn.

Claim 103 recites monitoring the content of communications with the mobile device on a wireless data call at an air gateway, receiving at an air agent coupled to the air gateway one or more service triggers from an intelligent service platform agent and detecting in the content at the air gateway a predefined event based on the one or more service triggers, the predefined event associated with a wireless data call service. Claims 1, 31 and 61 recite similar elements. Applicants respectfully submit that *Stewart* does not disclose monitoring content of communications on a wireless data call at an air gateway, receiving at an air agent one or more service triggers from an intelligent service platform agent and detecting at the air gateway a predefined event based on the service triggers. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 31, 61 and 103 are patentable over the cited art used in the rejection and request that the rejections of Claims 1, 31, 61 and 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 19-20, 22, 26 and 30 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1; Claims 39, 49-50, 52, 56 and 60 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 31; Claims 69, 79-80 and 82 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 61; and Claims 104-109 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 103. Therefore, Applicants respectfully contend that each of Claims 9, 19-20, 22, 26, 30, 39, 49-50, 52, 56, 60, 69, 79-80, 82 and 104-109 are each patentably distinguishable from the cited art used in the rejections, for example, for the same reasons discussed above with regard to their respective base claims.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at (214) 953-6511 to schedule the telephone conference.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants

  
Chad C. Walters  
Reg. No. 48,022

Date: June 12, 2006

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

Customer Number: **05073**